DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 124 615 UD 016 063

AUTHOR Schnidler, Paul T.
TITLE The National Program for Educational Leadership: An Experiment in Adult Socialization.
PUB DATE Apr 76
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting (San Francisco, California, April 1976); Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Change Agents; Change Strategies; City Problems; *Consortia; Educational Change; *Educational Innovation; Educational Problems; Leadership Qualities; Leadership Responsibility; *Leadership Training; Participant Characteristics; Program Descriptions; Program Design; Program Development; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Recruitment; Research Problems; Social Action; Social Change; *Success Factors; *Training Objectives
IDENTIFIERS *National Program for Educational Leadership; NPEL

ABSTRACT

Various dimensions of this national education and leadership program are explored by this case study that presents both successful and unsuccessful aspects of its components. The major objective of the National Program for educational Leadership (NPEL) is to establish a national consortium and national network of educational leaders who will work together to develop a different way of identifying and training educational leaders. Among the program elements that are addressed are the following: the environment and psychological set of the core group working with NPEL, the hypotheses tested by NPEL, the minor foci of NPEL, the recruitment process, and the evaluation history of the program. From a micro perspective the program is not judged successful and its more severe critics accuse it of rampant dilettantism and loss of focus. However, from a micro perspective NPEL accomplishes far more than the recruitment selection and training of men and women whom it serves, as it is an effort in institution building, not solely a leadership development program. The interactions and discussions between the program officers and the evaluators and the reviews expressed by each side demonstrates one of the more intriguing themes in the program's history: the inevitable conflict between dream and program. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED124615

The National Program for Educational Leadership

An Experiment in Adult Socialization

by

Dr. Paul T. Schindler

Director, Education Policy Fellowship Program

Prepared for the American Educational Research Association Meeting

April 1976

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UD 016 063

From the NPEL Program Announcement:

> "The purpose of NPEL is to identify, recruit and prepare able men and women for leadership positions in education, particularly urban school systems. Emphasis will be placed on attracting persons who generally have not been considered as candidates for administrative roles in the nation's schools. Individuals who enter the program will be based at one of six participating institutions, but will pursue significant portions of their experience outside them.
>
> "The NPEL departs from traditional programs in many respects. It draws upon the nation as its talent pool, both for recruitment and instruction; it features individual programming, fashioned around the particular needs of each Fellow and is responsive to the requirements of identifiable leadership criteria. The program exists apart from universities, but is, at the same time, dependent on them. It will not lead to a degree or certification in the conventional sense.
>
> "A critical assumption of the program is that every candidate will bring unique talents to it and that curricular experiences must be structured to complement these talents. To that end considerable introspection by the individual, as well as the discussions with others, will precede the design of individual programs. An infinite array of opportunities will be available. The nature and length of individual programs will vary, but no Fellow will continue for a period longer than two years.
>
> "An individual sponsored by a participating institution will have access to courses, seminars, counseling and independent study. Fellows will likewise have opportunities to participate in internships, clinical services, counsel, observation, skill training -- whatever is thought to be critical, wherever it exists. Coordinators at each participating institution will assist Fellows in planning both on- and off-campus elements of their program."

This paper reports on what is essentially a success story.

Its success is determined not only by the significant number of men and women who gained an understanding and a respect for the problems of urban education and social change, but also because it was, in fact, a social science experiment conducted in the field. This paper will explore many dimensions of this social experiment and will demonstrate success and failures of each element. However, the major message is that the program was a success in great part because of the vision and daring of the social architects who designed it. Anyone familiar with American education and leadership development programs over the last 15 years can perceive numerous daring innovations articulated in the NPEL brochure statement quoted above. Since one of the most conventional ways of achieving success is to set modest goals, it should not be surprising that most educational leadership programs have achieved modest success by their own standards. NPEL probably fell far shorter of attaining its ambitious goals than most other programs, but, even in falling short, accomplished more. If there was any single thematic failing in the architecture or implementation phases of NPEL, it was that the primary artisans -- the co-directors, Richard C. Snyder and Luvern L. Cunningham -- were perennial optimists. (One of them was heard quoted at a meeting as saying, "An optimist is one who will eat wormy nuts in the dark, and a pessimist

is one who has." Neither were pessimists.)

Emile Durkheim, in his classic book The Division of Labor in Society, observes that deviant acts have the unanticipated effect of pulling society together. The primary benefit for society of deviant acts and the criminal or the deviant who performs them is that the action serves to delineate in a practical way the limits of propriety. Quite often, norms and values are articulated in vague and general ways, and the very ambiguity produces conservatism. Once an act is declared deviant, then people know more clearly what is outside the law and what is inside, i.e., what is acceptable and what is unacceptable.

By testing so many hypotheses in one fragile program, NPEL not surprisingly had its share of failures. Viewed in isolation these failures might be facilely interpreted as a result of poor programming or poor implementation. In part, of course, this was the case as it is with any human endeavor, but the framing of the question is in error. The appropriate question to be asked is how NPEL fared relative to other alleged leadership-type programs that were being supported around the country at the time.

NPEL as an educational program produced deviants in Durkheim's sense, but those deviant acts and those systemic failures have done more perhaps for the activity of training

educational leaders than scores of modest and "safe" programs that have been funded by the private and public sector. In short, NPEL had a dual process. It attempted to prepare educational leaders to answer urban school needs in ways that other educational leaders were ill-prepared to do. But it had the larger goal of calling into question the very training models that had been taken for granted for nearly two decades. It was not that the directors and coordinators were unaware of their dual objectives, but, for many reasons, the time was never found or taken to allow the group to detach themselves sufficiently from the more manifest purpose (program management) to reflect on their own social experiment. Perhaps it is true with all innovative programs, but it certainly was true with NPEL that the staff--including coordinators and directors--were quite clearly the principal beneficiaries of the program. Two years after the inception of NPEL, Seymour B. Sarason of Yale University published a book entitled The Creation of Settings and the Future Societies. The book stands as a veritable manual for people attempting to establish an innovative program -- a new setting. The book allows an observer to be a "Monday-morning quarterback" in theorizing about systemic and systematic limitations in the NPEL structure. Sarason asks: "For whom does a setting exist?" In other words, what is the purpose of the innovation?

He answers:

> "Whenever I have asked people what the purpose of their setting is, the answer I invariably get is in terms of delivering something to somebody -- something people want. In fact, since the people know that I already know why their setting exists, their response is usually accompanied by a good deal of puzzlement. After all, if you work in a child guidance clinic, what other purpose can you have except to provide services to children and families. If you are a teacher in a school, obviously you're there to help children learn. What other purpose can a state hospital or reformatory or prison have than to rehabilitate its inmates? If you're starting a shirt factory, your job is to make and sell shirts.
>
> "It all sounds both obvious and natural: the major purpose of a setting inheres in what it does for or provides to others. There are two types of settings, however, in which the questions are not always answered in this invariant way: the church and the university. There are many in both of these settings who would claim that as important as any service they may provide to others are the creation and maintenance of those conditions which enable those in these settings to further their development regardless of the demands of the surrounding world." (From page 85; published by Jossey-Bass, 1972.)

Sarason goes on to point out that in virtually every new setting that he studied the participants have overlooked the function of the setting, which is to provide a learning opportunity and professional stimulation and excitement for the participants themselves. Disillusionment sets in when, in fact, they find that the activity is not sufficiently challenging or does not provide sufficient growth for themselves.

NPEL differed, however, from other new settings in that, intentionally or unintentionally, many of the resources --

psychic and monetary -- ended up being directed towards the goal of providing professional development and growth of the staff that ran NPEL.

Before engaging in an analysis of the various ingredients of the National Program for Educational Leadership, it is important to articulate a bit further the environment and the psychological set of the core group working with NPEL. The core group included the co-directors, associate director, coordinators, and professional support staff. The setting cut along two dimensions: first, the perception that all shared of the current state of American education, and the second dimension profiled the group spirit -- ethos -- as it began its planning and implementation of a response to the problem.

The shared view of the school world was enunciated in the proposal originally submitted to the U.S. Office of Education:

> "There is a national leadership crisis in education as well as other institutional sectors. Today's educational leaders are confronted with problems and issues, both new and old, that cumulatively tend to outstrip the coping capacity of conventionally prepared administrators. At the 'action level' there are matters of race, equality, finance, housing, negotiations, public confidence, violence and program. At the more esoteric level there are problems and issues of defining goals, objectives and purposes; reconciling strongly-held and bitterly defended positions among exceedingly pluralistic professional and client communities; and harmonizing

> the impulses for radical changes in institutional stability....In the early years of the 1960's some progress was made in improving research on administrative behavior as well as on the utilization of findings. But from the mid-point of the decade to the present, that momentum and its consequent gains have been lost. We are now desperate in education and elsewhere. The priority for improvement rests with education, however, since most other institutions in the society will stand or fall on the basis of success or failure in education."

The proposal then proceeds with two vignettes of "the nature of our despair".

The view expressed in the proposal was a dominant view at the time among liberal thinkers in education. An earlier article in Harper's Magazine by Allan R. Talbot entitled "Needed: A New Breed of School Superintendent" says, "He needs to be a combined guerrilla fighter, politician, and top-flight administrator -- but his nearly impossible job has very little to do with education." Talbot points out that the challenges facing urban superintendents were so dramatic, so challenging that the conventional school administrator/superintendent was perhaps the most ill-prepared and inappropriate person to hold that sort of a position. Talbot says:

> "Professional educators have long argued that a school superintendent must have technical experience, that to let a non-professional run a school system would be like allowing a plumber to perform brain surgery. This analogy is false. For in fact a superintendent is unlikely to devote more than

> ten percent of his time to questions of pedagogy. Most of his workday is spent arguing with the local finance board, negotiating salaries, reviewing contracts and architectural drawings, dealing with politicians....Few superintendents, to be sure, are happy with this state of affairs. They would far prefer to devote their energy to the educational problems for which they were trained. But they just don't have time. They are stuck with administrative/political battles for which they have no preparation at all. There is indeed no such training ground for administrators in any field. According to legend, when Robert McNamara tried to turn down the Defense Department job, arguing that he had no training for it, President Kennedy replied that he was aware of no schools for either Cabinet members or Presidents."

NPEL was born, consequently, in an environment that had brilliant recollection of cities afire because of heightened racism, charges of institutional racism, police brutality, police riots -- a congeries of events that had dramatic social and psychological impact on the best minds in the country triggered the cry for a new form of leadership. By the time even the first cadre of NPEL Fellows had completed their two-year Fellowship experience, however, major changes in society had occurred. Conservatism had reappeared. The change severely hampered the ability of NPEL to find jobs for its Fellows.

The second major characteristic of the NPEL experience was the quasi-religious motif felt by most of the original core group. Frequent comments were made about the awe, the virtual reverence, that all felt towards the two major

artisans of the program -- the co-directors. While coordinators and staff often complained to one another about the unrealistic aspects of the program and lack of hard planning, their views when with the co-directors were muted and generally deferential. By the time NPEL "de-mythologized" its leadership, the course had been set. Most staff had lowered their sights and diverted their energies to other endeavors. Several coordinators early on dismissed real hopes for a national program and focused on development of their own site -- "Balkanization" occurred.

Max Weber, an early social scientist, dealt with charismatic leadership in Charisma and Institution Building. Weber says:

> "Charisma knows only inner determination and inner restraint. The holder of charisma seizes the task that is adequate for him and demands obedience and a following by virtue of his mission. His success determines whether he finds them. His charismatic claim breaks down if his mission is not recognized by those to whom he feels he has been sent. If they recognize him, he is their master -- so long as he knows how to maintain recognition through proving himself. But he does not derive his right 'from their will,' in the manner of an election. Rather, the reverse holds: it is the duty of those to whom he addresses his mission to recognize him as their charismatically qualified leader."

The primary suasive force of the co-directors of NPEL over the professional staff was in their ability to articulate the "large picture" of the purpose of their joint venture. Coordinators and staff were not uncritical of the

macrocosmic perspective and somewhat abstract representation of the program, but as mentioned, their criticisms in the presence of the co-directors were muted and blunted. This produced a sense of anxiety in themselves because they realized that their short planning sessions (brought together from around the nation for a one and a half day meeting) were spent in seemingly endless activities of culture building and articulating shared norms and values instead of dealing with the numerous program issues, such as recruitment/selection; discussion of the curricula of the NPEL Fellows; when and if they were to come on board; and post-Fellowship placement of Fellows.

The power exercised by the co-directors of NPEL was scarcely as active and dramatic as implied by Weber's words "seizing the task"; their power was contained rather in their Weltanschauung; the view of the educational world that they had was so all-encompassing and dramatic and, perhaps, even seductive that every participant felt that he was part of an activity that was larger than life. Perhaps it might be postulated that there is an inherent deficiency in the charismatic form of leadership because the participants are reluctant to state criticisms. With few exceptions, this was the case during the first and critical year of NPEL. And since the coordinators were reluctant to criticize in

public and were ashamed to be "closet" critics, interesting sorts of behaviors developed, not the least of which was a sort of flight behavior in which coordinators often found reason to come late to meetings or, especially, to leave early from the planning sessions. Once safe in their individual sites, they were able to run their own programs, and plan to implement local recruitment and selection. In short, they began to undermine the critical hypothesis or objective of the program -- to establish a national consortium and a national network of educational leaders who would work together to develop a remarkably different way of identifying and training educational leaders. In the final analysis, very little networking developed in the NPEL experiment. There was much talk about building a support system for the program. Lack of funds, and especially lack of focused interest towards that end together combined to minimize any likelihood of that occurring.

NPEL hoped to test the hypothesis that conventional credentials of educational administrators were no longer required. The conventional credential was (and is) an M.A. or a Ph.D. (Ed.D.) in the field of educational administration with state certification of those degrees and the person's school experience -- the experience of "going through the chairs". Consequently, no degrees of any sort were awarded

by NPEL. A sizable minority of the fifty-two graduates of the program have now initiated or completed work towards an advanced degree -- usually the doctorate. This was especially true of racial minorities in the program who felt that they were particularly disadvantaged by not having the advanced degree.

Another hypothesis tested by NPEL was a general lack of confidence in the rote curriculum set aside to prepare education administrators. Consequently, the NPEL program highlighted individualized curricula for all Fellows. The major role of the coordinator was to assist the Fellow in identifying any and all sorts of learning experiences in which that Fellow could learn about education. Since the Fellows were on a high stipend (maximum $18,750) for each of the two years of the Fellowship, placement with an education administrator in a superintendent's office at the state, local or building level did not require intricate negotiations because, after all, the Fellow did not cost the host agency anything in terms of salary or fringe benefits. It was also thought that the Fellows would be voracious readers and learners, and perhaps the main role of the coordinator would be to keep out of the way of the high-powered men and women in the program who would be impatient to learn as much as they could in the two-year period. This was a highly

inflated expectation because the Fellows were pretty much like anyone else; they needed to be prodded into trying new things and, without that feeling of probable success in a new area or new venture, they militated towards the tried and true. Consequently, a minister who had experience in family counseling became the Fellowship expert in interpersonal relationships in education. The long-range planner from a pharmaceutical company found his interests primarily in the area of planning in school systems. The pattern is substantially verified in most of the Fellowship, not only in the program activities, but in the post-Fellowship placements as well.

It would be a mistake to assume that the NPEL experience tested in fact only such hypotheses, such as transferability of leadership skills, individualized curricula, national consortium building, and mid-career resocialization. In fact, the NPEL was an attempt at a new institutional form that was fully crescive, meaning that the program, while working its way through the first half of the decade of the 70's, found itself attracted to many related endeavors, and perhaps committed the cardinal sin of attempting to "fold in" many of these activities to the NPEL experience. The most severe critics of NPEL therefore accuse it of rampant dilettantism and loss of focus. The creators of NPEL and

its strongest proponents view that elaboration as a healthy, natural organic sort of development. Whichever perspective is ultimately viewed as accurate, it's not an error to point out that NPEL freighted itself with numerous and perhaps overwhelming challenges in a five-year period with only limited professional staff.

Several of the additional foci of NPEL include the following: a conceptual effort to see NPEL as the prototype educational program focusing on institutional change. Thus, NPEL was an attempt to present a model that could revolutionize the training and development of educational leaders, especially urban administrators. NPEL additionally set the objective of developing a support system for the graduates of the program, a national network that would interface with other leadership organizations. It was felt that the NPEL alumni would be an elite band of "change" agents--a term still in vogue at the time--who would want to stay in close contact with one another for mutual support and intellectual stimulation. Thirdly, NPEL found itself attracted to the decision seminar method of planning. This concept originated with Professor Harold Lasswell of Yale and was developed in conjunction with the Citizens Education Task Force in Detroit, Michigan. A number of Fellows involved themselves in the articulation of the decision seminar methodology. But in any case, the concern with the methodology sapped the over-

committed time of the co-directors and their professional staff. In addition, the NPEL flirted for a time with an organization known as IMTEC (International Management Training for Educational Change). While this collaboration was relatively short-lived, once again it drew energies from the more central task of the continual development and operationalization of the activity called NPEL.

One of the inherent hazards in a case study approach in education is that it tends to be microscopic in perspective. It would appear that such a study is dysfunctional because it clouds the larger issues. To the extent that an endeavor is conventional, perhaps even pedestrian, a conventional case study report is satisfactory. However, the NPEL experience was neither conventional far less pedestrian, and its only substantial error was that it tried too hard and reached too far. From a micro perspective, therefore, it could not be judged successful. However, from a macro perspective, NPEL accomplished far more than the recruitment selection and training of several score men and women whom it served. It was an effort in institution building not solely a leadership development program. As has been said about schools for a long time "what is caught is often more important than what is taught". The more tolerant and open-minded were the beneficiaries (staff and Fellows), the more

they caught from the NPEL experience. There is strong evidence (perhaps this data will never be fully gathered) that the NPEL fellows and staff had a remarkable facility and willingness to attempt the unconventional. This should not be interpreted as equivalent to institutionalized deviancy, it is not that radical. But NPEL showed people that the field of education is more of an art than it is a science and that nothing should be considered a "given".

Relatively few recognized that their joint venture could be or should be seen as a social laboratory instead of merely another educational program.

In a unique book, Howard V. Perlmutter (Towards A Theory and Practice of Social Architecture: The Building of Indispensable Institutions) says: "Our purpose is to describe an evolution in the application of the behavioral sciences toward a theory and practice of building viable institutions. We call this area of knowledge and experience social architecture...which literally means master building." Perlmutter builds his views on work done by Kurt Lewin who maintained that there is nothing so practical as good theory and that theory, practice, and social action are more interconnected than most intelligent people realize. The point is that these theoreticians believe that the best way to understand a social institution is to attempt to build a social institution.

We are naive if we feel that all the essential institutions of society have already been constructed and now require merely maintenance and subtle modification. The NPEL founders felt that they were in the institution building business. They wanted, and in fact, welcomed the opportunity to test the ingredients of that institution, because through that testing, participants would hopefully perceive how the institution worked and how it did not work.

Perhaps the clearest way to distinguish between the NPEL experiment and the conventional leadership development program would be to elaborate the distinction between an organization and an institution. Selznick has defined an organization as

> "...a technical instrument for mobilizing human energies and directing them toward set aims. We allocate tasks, delegate authority, channel communication, and find some way of coordinating all that has been divided up and parceled out. All of this is conceived as an exercise in engineering; it is governed by the related ideals of rationality and discipline. The term organization thus suggests a certain barreness, a lean, no-nonsense system of conscientiously coordinated activities." (From page 5; Leadership in Administration, published by Rowe Peterson, 1957.)

An organization is therefore, dispensable, may be short-lived, and provides goods or services that may go out of style. Organizations by their very nature can be temporary and satisfy short-term needs.

Institutions on the other hand are characterized by quite different sorts of features. Perlmutter describes three characteristics of an institution:

> "An institution satisfies a function or service that is an essential ingredient of society. Its internal structures embody and protect commonly held norms and values of the society to which it is related. And third the institution influences the environment in positive ways." (From page 51; Towards A Theory and Practice of Social Architecture: The Building of Indispensable Institutions; published by Tavistock Publications, 1965.)

NPEL quite clearly was not an effort to establish merely another program to train bodies and improve schools. Rather, it attempted to define and crystallize new services that society needed, an elaboration of new needs that were seen as important.

The dual theme of the NPEL experience was that it was an experimental effort to create a new institutional form in education. The new institution was felt to be necessary because the existing efforts especially at the urban level were widely proclaimed as highly expensive failures. Few dared to attempt change, fewer yet had a vision of what creative educational change even meant.

A near fatal flaw occurred however, in the continuing definition of NPEL as an "experiment". The unanticipated reaction of Fellows was that while they admired and respected experimentation in the abstract, their career lines and their

personal and professional goals were too special to be subjected to a guinea pig endeavor. And the pressure became nearly inexorable for NPEL to define "what was given". Fellows demanded closure, they demanded many of the services that were readily promised by the programs that trained educational administrators in a conventional fashion.

NPEL made remarkable strides in preparing a cadre of men and women willing to attempt unorthodox means to obtain their ends in education. But it could have established a stronger foothold in developing a new institutional form if it had avoided some fairly traditional shortcomings. First of all, although NPEL was a five year program, most of the creativity was expressed and efforts were made to implement it in the first eighteen months of the program. This was true for two reasons. First of all, the directors and coordinators fell prey, it seems, to the "soft money syndrome". In education there is a strong need to obtain federal funds and foundation funds to support creative efforts. Once these funds are in place and encumbered there is an obvious need to search for additional funds. A number of the coordinators and many of the Fellows felt that this "hip pocket mentality" seriously limited the NPEL success. Instead of devoting needed energy for the development of NPEL potential as a new

leadership form, interests were diverted elsewhere and thus NPEL fell open to the charge of intellectual dilettantism. Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, the NPEL administrators seemed unprepared for the pressure that they would feel from the Fellows to run the program. During the first two national meetings the movement toward control of the program was evident. This movement exploded and the raw power became an entity unto itself. While this had many ramifications in all aspects of the program, the most evident was in the gradual deterioration of the quality of the Fellows who entered the program. With few exceptions, there were no Fellows in the last several cadres selected who were as strong as the average Fellow of the first two cadres selected. There seemed to be an almost devious inclination of the selection committees made up mostly of Fellows to choose subsequent participants who would not be a challenge either in the leadership of the program or especially in seeking out the fairly limited jobs that were available to the NPEL graduates. It had become clear that NPEL would experience difficulty in delivering on its promise to help Fellows find jobs.

In the first several rounds of the recruitment process, persons could be disqualified simply on the basis of "having a great deal of potential"--meaning that they had not yet

achieved significant leadership success in their career lines. In the subsequent stages of the selection process, the majority of NPEL Fellows fits clearly into that category: having a great deal of potential but not having had succeeded or demonstrated outstanding leadership ability in fields other than education.

Appendix A

EARLY EVALUATION OF NPEL

The Program's first evaluation team were devotees of the Stufflebeam CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) form of evaluation. The two persons from the OSU Evaluation Center had numerous responsibilities at the time they began work with OSU -- not the least of which was completion of Ph.D. programs at the University. They felt that the NPEL program lacked clarity and specific objectives -- the grist for their mill. From the beginning, they and the program officers appeared at cross purposes. The lack of goodness of fit, however, is more interesting in what was highlighted, than the content of the evaluation itself.

The interactions and discussions between the program officers and the evaluators -- and the views expressed by each side -- demonstrate one of the more intriguing themes in the history of NPEL: the inevitable conflict between dream and program.

The conflict of perspectives is illustrated by the oft-repeated statements of the evaluators -- most notably the first of the three in-house evaluator(s) to NPEL: "You can't have a Program without Objectives." The comment was not academic. It implied that program officers lacked specific, measurable objectives. In short, the first evaluators felt the program was aimless. One man's vision is

another man's nightmare -- especially if the latter is charged with providing a rationale.

Program officers felt that the evaluators should serve the program by documenting and assessing important functions such as selection of Fellows, perceived weaknesses in the recruitment process, gaps in the Fellows' programs and individualized curricula. From the beginning, it was recognized that these sorts of staff needs needed monitoring. However, any systems model of evaluation or planning will not stand still long for that ancillary function. It clamors for center stage and like a Procrustrean Bed, cuts the Idea to fit the structure or model.

Thus, conflict occurred and caricatures developed. The point is not to choose sides or give box scores, but to try and relate the process and themes: It seems that the scenario should be dubbed: Architect meets bricklayer -- can they find nappiness? The answer was "NO."

The architect of NPEL saw the program as an ideology reified after years of planning and thinking about weaknesses of educational leadership. Funding of the Program climaxed much labor and personal growth. It was not seen simply as another funded proposal. But with the funding came the harsh reality that specific actions must follow -- consistent with the intent of the well-nurtured dream. Evaluators

want that sort of "behavioral universe" yesterday or at least immediately so that they can get on about their task of measurement. The NPEL artisans, however, had a natural reluctance to lock into often irreversible patterns in specifying the Program. The most obvious deleterious effect of such decisions was that colleagues in the Program lost the opportunity to benefit from the thinking-through-process that the program officers experienced. The creation, birth and development that they had experienced should be shared as much as possible. As the Book of Genesis says, man was charged by God to name the things of the world -- thus he became a co-creator. Similarly, colleagues in NPEL wanted to participate in the fleshing out of the idea of NPEL in ways consistent with the original vision.

But such process frustrates the evaluator in search of measurable actions. "The program officers," they said, "are trying to build a program with a new educational leadership tool, but they can't because they don't have the tools.... So little research or planning went into NPEL....You can't evaluate a program that does not have objectives." What was meant, of course, was measurable, quantifiable objectives. There emerges a clear sense of irritation and impatience with program officers who refuse to concretize their ideas in ways compatible with evaluation needs.

The first evaluators for NPEL felt overwhelmed with their task: not only did they see the need to conduct what was called a "retrospective context evaluation" and simultaneously initiate a "retrospective input evaluation," but felt that they had to educate the program officers on the nature of responsible evaluation -- all of this while completing work on their own doctoral programs and conducting several evaluations of other programs. There was not sufficient time for the extensive discussions that should have been held. Instead, the evaluators attended and observed coordinator meetings, selection meetings, and had discussions with the associate director of NPEL. There interactions, however, did not provide sufficient opportunity to assess fully each other's legitimate perspective. The result was that NPEL was not prodded toward further specification of its theories of career change, institution building, or recruitment, selection and placement for an innovative program. Similarly, the first evaluators were not jarred from the ivory tower of their pure model. This was the first full opportunity the Evaluation Center had to use the CIPP model. The maiden voyage made the artisans less willing, perhaps, to compromise at all when attempting to apply it to a specific problem, program or issue. The evaluators were not compelled to see evaluation as a planning/

operational tool of management and instead remained superior to the day-to-day concerns of program officers.

The lack of full dialogue occurred too seldom and, perhaps, a bit too defensively; thus, marriage of program ideal and evaluation was not consummated. The compromise so often found in human interaction became the mode shared by program officers and evaluators. The evaluators felt that they quite soon became "tolerated" and ignored. For example, they did not have freedom to visit other sites to observe the recruitment-selection rounds and compare to the Headquarters approach. The two quarter-time evaluators -- total half-time contract -- did not feel that they could participate sufficiently to do justice to the evaluation, and most importantly, they felt that their procedure was coopted and diluted.

The best indication of the eventual structural incapacity may be found in the "Retrospective Context Evaluation" delivered to NPEL program officers in December 1970. The 17-page "Evaluation" was distilled from conversations with several persons associated with NPEL and the original proposal. Since it was merely a re-hash of those ideas, it is not surprising that it was found of little value by the program officers. In fact, it reflected not NPEL nationally, but the one program at OSU. The evaluators never visited

any program site but OSU.

The CIPP model used by the evaluators requires that behavioral objectives be established by program officers. The evaluators expressed chagrin that not only were these not available prior to the launching of the recruitment/selection procedures, but that "it was like pulling hen's teeth" to get them to list them. Eventually, the following sort of compromise was achieved -- listing of NPEL Objectives. But, perhaps it was more like a tie in football because the objectives did not particularly help the program officers, nor were they behavioral objectives in the conventional sense -- therefore useless to the evaluators. The end of the relationship was in sight.

OBJECTIVES FOR THE NPEL: "The National Program for Educational Leadership was organized and is presently structured to accomplish the following objectives:

1. One hundred new educational administrators will be prepared through NPEL over the five years 1970-75.

2. The NPEL will identify potential candidates nationally for its program.

3. Demonstrated leadership ability and commitment to the resolution of school problems will be among criteria for admission to the program.

4. Able men and women who meet these criteria will be recruited from across the nation.

5. A significant proportion of the recruits will be

chosen from among able persons who do not have the kind of professional education background and experience usually associated with school administrators.

6. Among the able persons recruited for the NPEL program will be persons from minority groups.

7. The training given recruits will be such that they will be able to assume leading administrative positions in public education.

8. The program will provide a broad range of curriculum choices, including many educative experiences outside the university, or at least beyond the limits of a single university.

9. The training program will be highly individualized.

10. Individuals will complete training in two years or less.

11. Individual program decisions will be based on personal introspection of the trainee and upon diagnosis on the part of others.

12. The process of leading to individual program decisions will be recorded so as to produce data relevant to choice among the array of cognitive, effective and skill developing experiences available.

13. An advisory panel including persons from community organizations, school systems, professional organizations, foundations, and governmental agencies will be formed.

14. The advisory panel will contribute program ideas.

15. The advisory panel will serve as a communication agent.

16. The advisory panel will provide program appraisal.

17. The advisory panel will select students.

18. The advisory panel will legitimize the students' completion of the program.

19. Persons who complete the program will receive endorsements of their ability to serve as educational leaders from the National Program.

20. Endorsements will be individualized, appropriately noting the special experiences and accomplishments of each participant.

21. The program will assume responsibility for locating placement opportunities for Fellows.

22. School systems and other educational agencies will recognize the high quality of the persons completing the program with the effect that these persons will be readily employable as administrators.

23. The administrative positions assumed by the Fellows upon completion of their program will be commensurate with their interests.

24. A significant proportion of the positions in which Fellows are placed will be in large urban school systems.

25. The program development process will be systematically monitored and recorded.

26. Critical comparisons of the NPEL program with traditional training programs will be facilitated by the maintenance of process records.

27. A spill-over effect of the NPEL program will be to foster achievement of a critical mass of thinking, resources and commitment to leadership development in education."

(From A Retrospective Content Evaluation-Report, December, 1970.)

It should be noted that perhaps the only objectives that conform to the behavioral objectives model required by CIPP evaluation are numbers 1, 10, 13, and 17. The remainder consist of generalized hopes of the proposal that would require further planning to admit of quantification, there-

fore measurement. By accepting such generalized objectives in their scheme, the first evaluators incapacitated themselves. Thereafter, they turned to the issue most pressing to program officers: selection of Fellows.

However, before leaving the listing of Program objectives, one further comment should be made: nowhere is it mentioned that the Program was committed to "parity" among minorities and "Anglos". This issue of minority recruiting (not defined so as to include women or Indians) dominated the second and third years of the Program. In the heat of the discussion, and the spirit of the time, it would have been inflammatory to observe that there seemed to be no basis in fact for the assertion. Objectives 5 and 6 above do not seem to be strong support for the position of "parity". The argument based on several lines from the original proposal also seems inconclusive.

There arises the ineluctable question: what would NPEL have looked like if the initial evaluators had been able to cajole, advise and encourage program officers to operationalize the 27 objectives listed above? Management by objectives can be dull, always arduous, but often rewarding.

The operating officer of NPEL felt that the form of evaluation available with the CIPP method verged on the functionally irrelevant -- not what was needed. It did not help him

with management problems he faced on a day-to-day basis.

The evaluators made several serious efforts in their short relationship with NPEL to sell their perspective. Not only did they delineate their view of the program in their several retrospective reports, but also prepared a memorandum that received limited circulation. The subject of the memo was "The Relation of Evaluation to NPEL." Perhaps more than any other single report they prepared, the memo highlighted the esoteric nature of the CIPP system's approach to evaluation. The memo spelled out the essentials of a successful program based on the NPEL philosophy. While the memo is too lengthy to reproduce and difficult to summarize -- as most systems approaches seem to be --it listed five program-support components designed to insure flexibility and continued capability of the program to adapt in a changing environment. The model allegedly heightened the likelihood that NPEL would remain responsive and reasonably open-ended. The five components are:

1. a program resource data bank;
2. a continuing program evaluation system;
3. a continuing overall program design system;
4. a trainee guidance system; and
5. a system for continuing training of both active and potential Consortium members.

While the terminology of the above is impressive in the abstract, they were not presented to program officers in the abstract, but under quite pressured conditions. The officers felt constrained to get the Program underway. Washington is not disposed to feel pleased by paper programs for very long. They want visible results. Consequently, there was a real press to get Fellows "on board". Although coordinators' meetings were replete with philosophizing about the nature of the trust and challenge, when the group disbanded and returned to their sites -- especially the headquarters site -- the dominant issue was that of operationalizing the program -- to prove that there was a program. So, systems approaches to planning seemed quite inappropriate. The inevitable systems chart that accompanied the five functions listed above consisted of ten very wordy boxes and thirty-seven arrows pointing seemingly randomly hither and yon over to the margins of the pages. The title was "A General Training Model for NPEL." It never got beyond the OSU campus. The complicated but very thoughtful memo was never discussed by coordinators and apparently was not implemented in any way. The unfortunate part was that NPEL continued to have serious difficulties with all of the areas identified in the memo until the completion of the Program. In all fairness, it should be emphasized that

there is no attempt to imply that early attention to the memo and implementation of major points would have alleviated those difficulties. That question is moot. But the underlying assumptions seem plausible: the evaluators tried early on in the program to shed light on endemic weaknesses of the new effort and for numerous reasons they felt they couldn't get a fair hearing. They were brought into the NPEL picture to help in dealing with a problem, but the tool they used was so recondite and mysterious that it became part of the problem. It reminded one of the chemist who developed a cure for a disease that no one seemed to have.

The evaluators felt frustrated and misused. Quite soon they decided that NPEL was as bureaucratic and defensive as the educational institutions it was claiming to change. They could not get to the decisionmakers of the Program, but only to the person they felt was a functionary. Seeing the need for educating the educators to the evaluation model, they instead found it necessary to corrupt and oversimplify the model to provide some minimal payoffs for the decisionmakers.

They felt -- as systems devotees must -- that their concept was every bit as challenging, macrocosmic and stimulating as the NPEL concept. Like a giant paramecium, it

envelopes any contiguous delectable object. It could have been successful and useful to NPEL program officers and the program generally only if both concepts had grown together through much interaction and sharing. Coming on the scene later, as it did, was dysfunctional for both concepts.

The evaluation team most immediately tried to assist the associate director in the task of getting the program running. Specifically, this meant "selection." His assessment of the assessment model was succinct: "It doesn't help me in my work. They have asked me to prepare a laundry list of specific objectives for the program. It's possible to have a humanistic approach within a system's model. We can't, nor do we need to quantify every management decision, especially the decisions in regard to selection."

Although the CIPP model of evaluation fell short of the perceived needs by NPEL officers, it could only stand as a beacon in the night compared to another sort of evaluation made of NPEL by the Educational Management Services of Edina, Minnesota.

In May of 1970 the Leadership Training Institute engaged Educational Management Services for the purpose of reviewing and evaluating the various projects that existed under the general auspices of the LTI umbrella. The evaluation consisted of site visits and questionnaires. The evaluator

visited Headquarters Campus for part of one day in November of 1970. The 12-page report to the LTI was released the following February. The only persons contacted at Headquarters were the associate director and one NPEL Fellow. The other top program officers were unaware of the evaluator's presence as were the CIPP evaluators. The succinct report provides the following dichotomous forms of information:

> There is no evidence that the NPEL has had any community involvement in the project planning and management. (The report notes that only 1 of the 17 projects visited had such involvement.)
>
> There is no evidence of any alliance between school systems and the university. (True also of 11 other programs of the 17.)
>
> There is evidence that NPEL is a program where the Fellows appear to be headed for high level leadership positions. (Seven other programs of the 17 shared this quality.)
>
> NPEL provided an alternative to traditional educational administration programs. (So also did 12 other programs of the 17.) The program at the Univ. of Minnesota was taken as a baseline on a hypothetical scale of traditionalism.
>
> Minority Recruitment? Yes for NPEL and all but five of the programs.
>
> Will the NPEL program have institutional impact? Yes for NPEL and nine of the other programs.

The Evaluation Report prepared in the manner of the above survey may have served some useful needs but this writer has not yet determined them. Only one program officer

in NPEL seems to have received the report. None of the program officers in the City-University Project -- another LTI/EPDA project -- recall seeing it, although in designing subsequent evaluation, program officers of the City-University Project used it and a similar study as a negative norm.

At the end of the calendar year 1970, it had become clear that the CIPP model of evaluation and NPEL were each macro-systems in the making and thus it was unlikely that one would serve the other's needs. Consequently, several alternative strategies were considered:

> "Assemble an advisory panel to assist the Evaluation unit in designing criteria for measurement of program objectives.
>
> "Identify and train graduate students at each of the locations to provide on-site evaluations.
>
> "Due to the dynamic and changing nature of the program, it was suggested that NPEL employ a full-time in-house evaluator to assess the program."

Although advisory boards existed in each of the locations, their actual participation in evaluation was uneven across the sites, and diminished with time.

Regarding the second recommendation above, NPEL identified and trained graduate students in conjunction with NPEL. At three of the sites -- Headquarters, West coast, and Midwest -- the graduate students actively participated in managing the NPEL site activity, coordinating Fellows'

activities -- in some sense mildly monitoring them -- or trying to. Not surprisingly, this was seen as meddling by a number of the Fellows and subtle efforts were initiated to "keep the grad student in his place." These tactics included asking the grad student to "follow up on some details" of planning at the conclusion of a meeting with the Fellows, grad student and coordinator. Secretarial tasks were also nudged their way. In two out of the three cases where graduate students were actively involved with the Fellows, hostility developed with at least some of the Fellows. The graduate students did not study the CIPP model or engage in evaluation in any formal way. Their evaluation consisted of the same sort as that of the coordinators -- informal, pragmatic and situational.

NPEL took its strongest stride toward systematic evaluation by following the third course of action mentioned above: hiring a full-time evaluator -- so-called in-house.

The Final Report prepared by the second of the full-time in-house evaluators documents the strategies used to measure performance of Fellows and the Program. The success of the evaluation effort is reinforced by the evolutionary nature of NPEL. Because shared decision making characterized the program, NPEL embodied varied and numerous

recruitment-selection placements models and nearly as many governance styles.